





United States Patent and Trademark Office

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE United States Patent and Trademark Office Address: COMMISSIONER OF PATENTS AND TRADEMARKS Washington, D.C. 20231 www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.	
09/747,627	12/22/2000	Shinichiro Yamada	09792909-4734	1822	
26263	7590 02/14/2003				
SONNENSCHEIN NATH & ROSENTHAL P.O. BOX 061080 WACKER DRIVE STATION			EXAMINER		
			CREPEAU, JONATHAN		
CHICAGO, II	, IL 60606-1080 ART UNIT		ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER	
			1746	10	
			DATE MAILED: 02/14/2003		

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

	Application No.	plicant(s)	- 1 */-			
Advisory Action	09/747,627	YAMADA ET AL.				
Advisory Action	Examiner	Art Unit				
	Jonathan S. Crepeau	1746				
The MAILING DATE of this communication appe	ars on the cover sheet with the c	correspondence add	ress			
THE REPLY FILED 03 February 2002 FAILS TO PLACE Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appel Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.	void abandonment of this applications to the control of the contro	cation. A proper re ch places the appli	ply to a cation in			
PERIOD FOR RE	EPLY [check either a) or b)]					
a) The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection. b) The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f). Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any						
earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).	initis are the maining date of the final reje	solion, event in timely filed,	may readed any			
1. A Notice of Appeal was filed on Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.						
2. The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered b	ecause:					
(a) X they raise new issues that would require furth	er consideration and/or search ((see NOTE below);				
(b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);						
(c) they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or						
(d) they present additional claims without cancel	ing a corresponding number of	finally rejected clai	ms.			
NOTE: See Continuation Sheet.						
3. Applicant's reply has overcome the following reject	tion(s):					
4. Newly proposed or amended claim(s) would canceling the non-allowable claim(s).	be allowable if submitted in a s	separate, timely file	d amendment			
5. ☐ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☐ request for application in condition for allowance because:		sidered but does No	OT place the			
6. The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered be raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.	cause it is not directed SOLELY	to issues which we	ere newly			
7. For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment explanation of how the new or amended claims w			and an			
The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:						
Claim(s) allowed:						
Claim(s) objected to:						
Claim(s) rejected: <u>1-7</u> .						
Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration:						
8. The proposed drawing correction filed on is	a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disap	proved by the Exan	niner.			
9. Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s)(PTO-1449) Paper No(s)						
10. Other:						







Application No.

Continuation of 2. NOTE: The proposed amendments to claim 1 are considered to raise new issues requiring further consideration/search since they were previously recited only in other independent claims (2 and 3). However, the proposed incorporation of the subject matter of claim 7 into claim 6 does not necessarily raise a new issue since claims 6 and 7 were both rejected over the same combination of references. However, Applicant's arguments with respect to newly proposed claim 6 are not persuasive. Applicants state that "the multiplicity of references that supports claim 6" is evidence of the nonobviousness of claim 6. In response, reliance on a large number of references in a rejection does not, without more, weigh against the obviousness of the claimed invention. See In re Gorman, 933 F.2d 982, 18 USPQ2d 1885 (Fed. Cir. 1991). Further, Watanabe's disclosure of assembling the battery in an inert gas atmosphere is still considered to fairly suggest pouring electrolyte into the battery in such an atmosphere.

RANDY GULAKOWSKI SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER

TECHNOLOGY CENTER 1700